

Exhibit G

State Department Daily Press Briefing

Briefer: James B. Foley

State Department website

July 8, 1999

<http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/terror/99070802.htm>

TRANSCRIPT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE DAILY PRESS BRIEFING

(begin transcript)

Foley: Good afternoon. Welcome to the State Department briefing.

Q: Is the Secretary going to Singapore?

Foley: I don't think that has been decided yet. As you know, the Secretary is away on vacation now, and I expect that Mr. Rubin will be in a position to talk in detail about her travel plans. We've indicated that she's likely to make a visit to the Middle East in the near future, to be determined, in consultation with the parties, including during Prime Minister Barak's visit here, now set for the 15th of July.

But in terms of her specific travel plans for the latter half of July, I think we'll have to await Mr. Rubin's return on Monday.

Q: So you're saying - and we'll report it if we have it right - so let me try again. Secretary Albright hasn't decided yet whether to go to the ASEAN --

Foley: Well, I can check that for you.

Q: Could you, because everybody out there is ready.

Foley: What do you mean out there?

Q: Well, Singapore, they think she's coming. And if you think we ought to tell them that she doesn't know if she's going there yet, we will.

Foley: Well, I know that you are quick to draw such conclusions, but -

Q: I'm not drawing conclusions. You said something, and I'm simply repeating it. Rather than leaving the room with what you said, I'm asking you to take another swing at it if I heard you right.

Foley: Okay, I told you I'd look into it.

Q: The New York Times has a report today that two countries in the Persian Gulf -- UAE and Qatar -- have been either cooperating or turning a blind eye to money laundering for the bin Laden organization through their controlled banks. Have you seen it; do you give it any credence?

Foley: I've seen that report; I read the article that appeared in the newspaper today. We don't have any reason to believe that the Foreign Minister of Qatar had anything to do with what was reported in the article; I can state that. Qatar is a valued ally. We enjoy a close and strong relationship. We work together in many areas, including the containment of Iraq, support for the peace process, maintaining Gulf security and combating terrorism. We are working positively with Qatar on a range of counter-terrorism issues, including improvement of the security of the US mission in Doha.

Q: That's a very narrow answer to what I thought a quite broad question, which also included the UAE.

Foley: Well, in terms of the UAE, we regard the United Arab Emirates, like the other GCC states, as a valued ally with whom we have a close and strong relationship in a broad number of areas. We're also working with the UAE to continue strengthening our counter-terrorism cooperation in many areas, including terrorist money laundering. The government of the United Arab Emirates has told us that the Dubai Emirates Government has taken steps to clean up the bank - the Dubai Islamic Bank - and to restore its reputation.

Q: So if they're taking steps to clean up, that implies that something had been amiss in the past at some time.

Foley: It does imply that, yes.

Q: And what was wrong? Was it -

Foley: I can't get into the details of it. I think what I said is significant enough, however.

Q: Well, without getting into the details, since we're talking about a bank, are we also talking about money laundering?

Foley: Well, as I said, the government has told us that the Dubai Emirate has taking steps to clean up that bank, and we are also cooperating with the UAE on a number of areas involving cooperation against terrorism, and that includes the area of money laundering.

Q: Are you satisfied with their cooperation?

Foley: We believe that in this area it has been sufficient. I know we had a team that was visiting the UAE not long ago, and they had a successful visit there.

Q: So the banking problem has been cleaned up?

Foley: Well, we believe that useful work was accomplished in the team's visit. We are pleased with the responsiveness of the UAE officials. As I said before, we have a strong and cooperative relationship with the United Arab Emirates on a variety of national security issues. As we said at the time of the East Africa bombings, we are working hard to interrupt the flow of money to and from the bin Laden organization that supports its terrorist network.

Q: Can I go back to Qatar? You said that you didn't think the Foreign Minister had anything to do with it; but what about everybody else in Qatar?

Foley: Well, that's the subject of an ongoing investigation, and I can't comment on it - especially since it does involve intelligence matters.

Q: Could you be a little more specific about what kind of team this was that went and when?

Foley: I don't have information about the team. I believe it was an inter-agency team, recently; I can check that for you after the briefing.

Q: The US is conducting an investigation of what happened in Qatar; is that what you're saying? There's an ongoing investigation now in Qatar by US officials?

Foley: It's a matter that's being looked into. I don't have any details about the investigation, but overall these involve intelligence issues which I can't discuss in a public forum.

Q: (Inaudible.)

Foley: There is an ongoing investigation.

Q: Involving the US or not?

Foley: Well, in terms of who is involved in it, I can check that for you if I can get into that in a public forum.

Q: (Inaudible) - and bin Laden. A \$5 million reward was issued some time ago and nine newspapers, including - (inaudible) - ads. That means that the \$5 million reward is not working, or somebody else is paying him more not to get arrested? And number two, are you putting pressure on those countries who are very close to the Taliban?

Foley: This question was asked and answered several times when we had a briefing here following the President's signature of the executive order concerning the US relationship with the Taliban. We believe that bin Laden is in Taliban-controlled territory in Afghanistan. Therefore, he enjoys safe haven in Afghanistan. In terms of the possible effect of our reward program, it has been very effective in numerous cases previously. This is an open case, and we very much would like to see Mr. bin Laden brought to justice.

So it's very premature to argue about the effectiveness or applicability of the reward program in this case. We know where he is; he's in Taliban-controlled parts of Afghanistan. I believe the Taliban spokesman today has confirmed the fact that he is in Afghanistan and that some Taliban members know where he is, which was somewhat contradictory to statements they made previously publicly to that effect.

So we are trying to make it very clear to the Taliban, who have the ability to ensure that bin Laden is brought to justice, that they ought to do just that; to allow him to be removed from the country and placed at the disposition of judicial authorities. I believe that the Taliban has a clear choice in this instance. They can continue to harbor him, but if they do, they forego any kind of international respectability and any chance of achieving their aspirations to international respectability and legitimacy.

Q: Just to follow, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Nawaz Sharif, was here on July 4, Sunday, in Washington, and met with President Clinton. Do you think there's any connection or link between the President's announcement on this Taliban statement on freezing the assets and bin Laden in Afghanistan?

Foley: If there's a link between what? I didn't -

Q: Between Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif's visit on Sunday and the presidential announcement on Afghanistan on Monday.

Foley: No.

Q: Can we go back to this investigation in the Gulf? Is that in both countries, or just in --

Foley: No, I was referring to Qatar.

Q: So there's no investigation in the UAE?

Foley: Not to my knowledge.

Q: Didn't the team go to UAE because of the suspicions and concerns? I mean, was that the reason for their visit?

Foley: That's my understanding.

Q: And you're saying you're going to check on when that visit was.

Foley: Yes.

Q: In your press statement on forthcoming US-Baltic Partnership Commission meeting released yesterday, among the issues that will be discussed in Washington the trans-Atlantic integration of the Baltic states is not even mentioned. What is the position of the State Department on rising concern - (inaudible) - in the Baltic states that because of Kosovo, they get overlooked in the enlargement of NATO?

Foley: We think that's a false reading of the situation. At the time of the last NATO summit here in Washington, the Alliance made clear that the door to membership of NATO remains open. That was not a mere rhetorical declaration on the part of the NATO leaders, because the summit also instituted a membership action plan which will permit an accelerated and intensive preparation for candidate members of NATO to continue to prepare the transformation that will be necessary for them to qualify for NATO membership. So I expect that that issue will be discussed when Deputy Secretary Talbott meets with the Baltic leaders here.

Q: Let's go back to bin Laden. Have any US embassies or posts abroad have seen their operations suspended or been closed in the last days? A few weeks ago, you shut some down or you suspended operations in some African - embassies in Africa. Do you have any today?

Foley: No, I don't.

Q: Madagascar?

Foley: The embassy -- as of yesterday, it was still closed. I'd have to check and see if that remains the case today.

Q: In Kashmir the fighting still goes on, and, at least according to reports from the region, there doesn't seem to be any pull-out seen yet of Pakistani allied forces. Can you give us any update from your point of view on that?

Foley: Well, the Pakistani Prime Minister Sharif has returned to Islamabad today. We understand he's going to be meeting with political and military leaders tomorrow to discuss his agreement with President Clinton; that concrete steps will be taken for the restoration of the line of control in Kashmir.

We are confident the Prime Minister wishes to see an end to this crisis. Both he and President Clinton agreed that once this crisis is resolved, the dialogue between India and Pakistan, under the Lahore Process, should resume without delay.

In the Kargel sector, fighting continues along the line of control. Indian leaders have declared that military operations will continue until all the forces infiltrated from Pakistan are removed or withdrawn from their side of the line. The US, along with others in the international community, is doing what we can to see the current dangerous crisis resolved as quickly and peacefully as possible.

Q: Do you believe that the Pakistani Prime Minister and his government have any control over the Pakistani guerrilla fighters, who are on the wrong side of the line of control?

Foley: Yes, we do.

Q: Does he have sufficient control to evacuate them to the right side?

Foley: We believe that it is indeed possible, and we think necessary, for Pakistan to ensure that those forces that have crossed from its side of the line of control on to the Indian side be withdrawn. And that is certainly what Prime Minister Sharif committed to do when he was here and met with President Clinton on Sunday.

Q: (Inaudible) -- guerrilla fighters?

Foley: Well, we've not spoken publicly about the composition of those forces, but we have made very clear that they crossed over from the Pakistani side and they should be withdrawn.

Q: But really, don't you think he made a promise in Washington with President Clinton that he's already broken? He committed - (inaudible) - but he now - the militants said we will fight until the last drop of blood and we will not withdraw. That means Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif is not in control. So who do you believe - the militants -- (inaudible) - or Sharif or the militants in Pakistan? Who's in control?

Foley: We work with the government of Pakistan and I think my answer to the previous question is the same answer to your question.

Q: On the Middle East, First Lady Hillary Clinton wrote a letter to a Jewish organization in New York supporting the move of the US Embassy in Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. What is the Administration's opinion of that? Does it complicate your policy regarding the peace process?

Foley: We don't have an opinion of it. The First Lady was expressing her personal views, and it does not complicate in any way our efforts to promote and accelerate the Middle East peace process. Our position - the Administration's position on the issue of Jerusalem has not changed. Israel and the Palestinians have agreed that Jerusalem would be one of the issues covered in the permanent status negotiations. This issue needs to be dealt with and resolved by the parties themselves in negotiations.

Q: Would you consider taking military action to hit Usama bin Laden?

Foley: We have taken military action against Usama bin Laden.

Q: Would you repeat that?

Foley: We do not rule out any options in the future for dealing with someone who poses such a direct threat to US national security and who is indicted for terrorist acts in the United States.

Q: Follow-up on bin Laden - there's a New York Times article today --

Foley: (Inaudible.)

Q: Oh, did you do that already? I have another question not on bin Laden. If the Taliban agrees that they will get him arrested, is the US ready to make some kind of deals with them? Just like --

Foley: We announced certain measures earlier this week concerning the Taliban that we would certainly be prepared to review and potentially to rescind if the Taliban do the right thing, which is to ensure that bin Laden is brought to justice. That would be a very positive step on their part.

We have a range of concerns in other areas with the Taliban concerning the future of Afghanistan and its political make-up. But in order to be at the table and recognized internationally as a group that is not besmirched with the reputation of harboring terrorists, it's necessary for the Taliban to take this first essential step.

Q: One really quickly. Is there anything new on the American in North Korea?

Foley: No, nothing new on that.

Q: And the second one, do you have anything on this ongoing unpleasantness in the Solomon Islands?

Foley: Yes, I do. The press reports we've seen give an accurate account of the internal conflict that is now besetting the Solomon Islands. Our embassy in Port Moresby, Papua-New Guinea, which also covers the Solomon Islands, has reported episodes since January of ethnic violence between armed militants native to the island of Guadalcanal and settlers from the neighboring island of Malaita.

On June 10, we issued a public announcement advising American travelers to Guadalcanal to exercise caution. This announcement followed reports of armed clashes that pitted members of the "Guadalcanal Revolutionary Army" against settlers from the outer island of Malaita, and sometimes against law enforcement personnel.

The Prime Minister of the Solomons has invited the commonwealth to mediate this dispute. Former Fiji Prime Minister Rabuka has been designated chief mediator by the commonwealth and has reportedly been successful in encouraging some of the parties to the dispute to sign a peace accord. The United States encourages all parties to reach a peaceful resolution of this internal strife.

Q: Is the United States thinking about doing anything to help the Congo -- help implement the peace agreement that is supposed to take hold in the Congo?

Foley: Well, we are certainly eager to help in any way we can. The fact is, I think it was the foreign defense ministers, signed the agreement yesterday but it remains to be officially signed by the heads of state on Saturday, this coming Saturday, July 10. We welcome the agreement and we congratulate President Chiluba and the other participants in the talks for their successful efforts. We encourage the

parties to the conflict not only to sign the agreement on Saturday, but to implement and to adhere to the proposed cease-fire and to act in good faith to engage the citizens of the Congo and neighboring states to pursue their lives in peace, prosperity and democracy.

President Clinton has stated on previous occasions that we would consider supporting a peacekeeping force if there were an appropriate cease-fire arrangement. We're going to carefully study any proposal for a UN peacekeeping operation, especially its mandate, before making any decisions about US support for the operation or role in it, but we are eager to be supportive. After the agreement is signed and after we have a chance to study it in some detail and consult with the regional states, we'll be in a better position, I think, to assess exactly what will be required to help ensure that the agreement is durable and is successful.

Q: How quickly do you think you're going to have to move on it, though? It seems to me that they signed the agreement, you have to get peacekeepers in there fairly quickly.

Foley: Well, I believe that there are already African peacekeepers there on the ground, and it's a question of determining formally what the peace accord calls for in terms of implementation, in terms of enforcement, and then determining what role would be necessary for African peacekeepers and what role the international community can play to support them.

As I said, we're prepared to play a positive role, and we've indicated all along and we've been involved in the diplomatic efforts that helped achieve this agreement, and we want to make sure that this agreement is successful, given the importance of the Democratic Republic of Congo to stability throughout the whole region there and the fact that so many other countries have been drawn into that struggle. This is an important opportunity to turn the Congo back into a potential successful story, which it certainly has not been. In fact, it's been a drag on the entire region. So we have an important stake in seeing this succeed. But it is a little early for us to determine how this agreement is going to be implemented and enforced. We're going to have to see the details and to consult in the days ahead.

Q: Do you have a response to the report that's coming out by the panel headed by former CIA Director Deutch, saying that poor coordination in the government makes it more difficult to fight or limits the US' ability to fight the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction?

Foley: I've not seen that report; I couldn't comment on it.

Q: Oh, it was first reported this morning, I think, in The Baltimore Sun. Could I just ask you one specific thing about it? Is the US Government looking at ways to improve the coordination with other agencies on that subject?

Foley: Again, I've not seen the report; I couldn't possibly comment on it.

Q: On North Korea, is the US concerned that the North Koreans may be building a new underground missile launching site base?

Foley: Well, it's certainly well-known that North Korea is actively pursuing development of two long-range ballistic missiles, the Taepo Dong I and the Taepo Dong II. North Korea launched the Taepo Dong I with a third stage in a failed attempt to orbit a very small satellite last October. I can't go beyond that in terms of what we know about the details of North Korea's missile development activities, but they do exist and it is something that we follow and we take with the utmost seriousness.

We view North Korea's missile activities as a serious threat to the region and also to our non-proliferation interests. In past rounds of missile talks with the DPRK and in other bilateral contacts with Pyongyang, we have continued to press vigorously for restraints on North Korea's production, deployment, testing and export of missiles and missile technology. We have repeatedly made clear that further missile tests would have serious consequences for our relations with North Korea, with direct implications for the prospects for improved relations that were discussed during former Secretary Perry's visit to Pyongyang.

We continue to consult closely with our allies, Japan and the Republic of Korea, who share our serious concerns about North Korea's missile proliferation activities.

Q: You're saying about the program; the question was about the tunnel. That would be part of the program -- maybe they haven't gotten that far. Remember, there was a tunnel looked at and seemed to have passed the test. So the question, I think -- I understand your position -- but they have ongoing programs to test two missiles. Have they done anything about a tunnel?

Foley: I can't comment any further.

Q: A North Korean defector is saying that the Japanese exported the missile to North Korea. Can you comment on that?

Foley: Well, there's legislation before the Japanese Diet now about export controls. What I can tell you is that we share very much the concern with our Japanese friends over North Korea's missile program, and we believe that the Japanese understand fully the importance of effectively controlling exports of sensitive items. Japan is a member of all the multilateral non-proliferation regimes, and we frequently discuss in those contacts with Japan a wide range of non-proliferation and export control issues.

Japan also shares our serious concerns about the DPRK's missile proliferation activities. Japan has a mature export control system and, as I said, we consult on an ongoing basis regarding ways to improve the effectiveness of export controls. And we certainly support what the Japanese Diet is considering.

Q: Is William Perry's report close to being finished?

Foley: It's nearing completion, that's my understanding.

Q: Do you know when it will be released?

Foley: I don't have a date for you.

Q: There are some reports that the North Koreans started another construction on another site which can turn out to be a nuclear site. Can you confirm that?

Foley: I can't confirmed anything having to do with intelligence, but I can't confirm that.

Q: Kosovo - what's being done in the United States in terms of returning refugees that are here back to Kosovo? Are there sort of steps in the works about when and how they will be returned back to the province?

Foley: Well, we brought about 9,600 Kosovar Albanian refugees to the US since early May. Of the 4,000 that were processed through Fort Dix, only about 270 have yet to be moved to their final resettlement locations throughout the US. There are some 2,000 Kosovars in Macedonia who have been approved by the INS for relocation to the US but who have not yet traveled. We're continuing to process UNHCR referred cases and cases with close family ties to the US.

However, it's interesting to note that close to half of the refugees scheduled for interview in Macedonia or for travel in recent days have not appeared as scheduled. We believe this is an indication that people are choosing to return to Kosovo rather than to seek resettlement in the US. The UNHCR is holding a meeting in Geneva on July 12, on Monday, to discuss the process of returning refugees to Kosovo who have been evacuated from Macedonia to third countries. The US Government will be represented at that meeting.

We fully intend to honor our commitment to Kosovars relocated in the US by providing return transportation to those who wish to go back to Kosovo. We're developing guidelines for the return program, which we plan to announce shortly after we consult at that Monday meeting with the UNHCR.

Of course, the decision -- this is important to emphasize, though, and we stated this at the time that we brought Kosovars into the United States. The decision to return to Kosovo or not would be made by the refugees themselves.

Q: Jim, can you say whether any who have come to this country have expressed an interest so far to stay here and not return?

Foley: I don't know that off hand. I can look into that. You know, we're going to be, as I said, announcing shortly details of our program to help return those who want to go back to Kosovo. I think when we do that, we'll be perhaps ready or in a position to talk about some of those details. I think probably the INS would be the ones who would know whether they've gotten those indications.

It's possible that there are many or some who want to stay who haven't signaled that because they don't have to for the first year. They were allowed to stay in the US for a year and then to adjust their status if they wished, after a year. So we may not, in the government, actually have that information. But I'll look into it, and we will have some kind of a briefing for you on this and we'll make sure we can answer that as best as possible.

I can tell you also UNHCR is reporting that some of the over 91,000 Kosovar refugees who were moved to other countries under the humanitarian evacuation program have begun to return home. This means the wider figure of Kosovars who have gone to many other countries besides the US, this also applies to the approximately 146,000 who have sought asylum apart from this program, of whom about 48,000 are in Germany and 33,000 in Switzerland. Thus far, there have been voluntary returns of refugees from Italy and Canada, and a group was due to leave Germany today.

As I said, the UNHCR is having this meeting on Monday in Geneva, and it will include the 28 countries which have participated in the humanitarian evacuation program to discuss the organized voluntary return of Kosovar refugees and asylum seekers.

Q: Do you have any comment on the signing of an economic pact between Russia and Belarus and the comments by the Russian Prime Minister about the imminent unification of the two countries?

Foley: Yes. The United States supports the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence of all the New Independent States. The sovereignty of the NIS countries contributes to the stability of the region. At the same time, we have said that we do not oppose integration as such among the NIS states, as long as such integration reflects the voluntary will of the people expressed through a democratic process, is mutually beneficial, and does not erect barriers to integration with the wider community of nations.

Absent the full restoration of democratic government in Belarus, it's hard to imagine that any popular approval process on union in Belarus would be truly democratic and representative of the will of the people.

Q: Jim, back to the question of the Kosovar Albanians that are in the United States - the 9,000-plus you were speaking about. Does this program that is being devised encourage, is it meant to encourage those people to return to Kosovo; and does the United States not wish to encourage those people to go back to help rebuild Kosovo?

Foley: Well, I was, I think, pretty clear on this a minute ago. It's a very important point that this is entirely up to the refugees themselves to decide whether they want to go back. When we made this offer of accepting up to 20,000 Kosovar refugees in the US, it was with the full knowledge that all of them potentially would indeed have the right to remain in the US if they wanted to. But it may be that indeed they can make a very significant contribution to the rebuilding of Kosovo; and that's not something that we would discourage. But neither are we going to make any kind of pressure on them to make a different decision. They have a right to stay here if they want to; that was the commitment we made.

Q: One of the largest US arms company executives - (inaudible) - in Athens. According to press reports, this computer stole several important US security secrets.

Foley: I've not heard that report.

Q: You don't have anything?

Foley: I've not heard anything about that, sorry.

Q: For about 20 days, there has been a Korean-American woman detained in North Korea and the US has asked for the North Koreans to make consulate contact. Is there any update on that; and if not, what are the consequences?

Foley: Well, I've been asked that question every day and it's a legitimate question. Your colleague, Mr. Lee, here, asked it a few minutes ago; maybe you weren't yet in the room or maybe you didn't get it. I just simply told him that there was nothing new on the issue.

But I can repeat what I have been saying for several days, which is that the DPRK Government has not yet notified the Swedish Charge that he would be permitted to travel to Rajin in order to have consular access to the detained American citizen. Acting on our behalf, the Swedish protecting power formally requested such consular access on June 23 and June 30. As I've indicated previously, both our bilateral interim consular agreement and the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations provides and necessitates such consular access to detained nationals. We consider a consular visit critical in order to ascertain in person the American's state of health and well being, and to ensure that she has not been mistreated. So we are going to continue to press for consular access at every available

opportunity. We have been in communication ourselves with the North Koreans through the New York channel.

I would note that most offices in the DPRK are closed now for, I believe, a three-day period to mark the fifth anniversary of the death of Kim Il Sung, so that may be a complicating factor in the immediate days. But that doesn't change in any way our determination to ensure that the consular access be achieved.

Q: Do you have anything on this attack on the embassy in Kiev?

Foley: I don't know; do we have anything on that, Julie? I seem to recall something. There was an incident and it was immediately investigated by the Ukrainian authorities. I know we've been cooperating with them, and we're pleased with the work they've done. But I don't have any update today on what the results of the investigation are.

Q: At what point does this lack of consular access to the woman who's in North Korea, at what point does the US seek additional steps? I mean, it's been three weeks or so. What are additional steps; what's available to you?

Foley: Well, I'm not going to speculate or hypothesize about a judgment we haven't made yet. I stated this in response to Matt's question yesterday or the day before that indeed there will come a time, if consular access hasn't been granted, when we are going to conclude that it's not going to be granted. Then it will be truly an important issue -- it already is an important issue because consular access is vital for us to ascertain that this woman is in good shape and that her interests are being represented. But we haven't made that judgment yet.

As I've explained, things can move slowly in North Korea. This is a remote area of the country. We have been in touch with the North Koreans ourselves and the Swedes are ably representing our interests, and we have not concluded that consular access will not happen. We wish it had happened by now, but we still expect that it will happen.

Q: Is the Administration considering removing Libya from the State Department terrorism list?

Foley: No, not at all. That report is wrong.

Q: About Indonesia -- as you know, next week the Secretary General of the United Nations is going to take a final decision about the conditions for a fair vote in East Timor. Some say, including in the Senate and the House, that this will be the appropriate moment to put additional pressure on Indonesia from the part of your government; for instance, putting a hold on the money of the World Bank in Indonesia, or even more than that - on arms transfer or military assistance from the United States to Indonesia. Can you respond on that?

Foley: Well, we think that holding the vote and holding a successful vote - namely, a peaceful vote that produces a genuine reflection of the will of the people on East Timor -- is in the interest of Indonesia as well as in the interest of the people of East Timor and of the region. So I don't believe that Indonesia needs persuading that this is in its interests.

However, we have concerns about the safety of the vote, the integrity of the vote. We believe that a vote is important; we hope it will take place. We support the UN's efforts to ensure that a successful vote take place, but we also want to ensure that the referendum is a peaceful and successful one.

Q: Will Assistant Secretary Roth carry this message when he goes to Indonesia this weekend?

Foley: Yes.

Q: Can you talk - is he going to see Habibie, do you know?

Foley: I don't know his schedule.

Q: Can you see if you can find out?

Foley: Sure.

Q: I want to go back to North Korea. Mr. Foley, you have said that another missile test would produce or create serious consequences. High ranking officials from this building and White House have said also like that. On the other hand, a high ranking official from this building and White House have said also even after another missile test, the United States wants to preserve the framework of the so-called agreed framework. It's not contradiction. I do want to know the United States' view.

Foley: Well, it's simply a fact that we regard the agreed framework is important to the security of the region and the security of the United States -- the continued freezing of North Korea's nuclear program. But in terms of what the specific negative consequences would be in the event of another North Korean missile test, I'm not prepared to be specific at this stage about what those consequences will be.

Q: At the risk of upsetting your no-bull policy, Jim, the --

Foley: Oh, no.

Q: The festival is now in its second day. I understand the State Department's cobbled together some information about advice to give to -- (inaudible) -- Hemingways --

Foley: You must have some inside information. Look, I made clear the other day that we have no-bull guidance, and we've never had any bull guidance or uttered any bull guidance from this podium. There was a bull question, and there have been frequent bull questions on previous occasions. But without wishing to set any kind of precedent, I do happen to have bull guidance today.

What I can tell you is that given today's security environment, no American can be considered safe from raging bulls.

There are, however, some commonsense precautions that US citizens may wish to consider taking to avoid becoming a target of an enraged, horned beast. If you find yourself in a crowd of frenzied, four-footed foreigners -- I guess they could be called that -- make sure your sneakers are tied, your valuables are safely stowed in your neck pouch and your medical insurance is thoroughly up to date. I have more, but I think that I've exhausted this; and that's no bull.

Thank you.

© Copyright 1999

FAIR USE NOTICE: This site contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available in our efforts to advance understanding of criminal justice, political, human rights, economic, democracy, scientific, and social justice issues, etc. We believe this constitutes a 'fair use' of any such copyrighted material as provided for in section 107 of the US Copyright Law. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, the material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes. For more information go to: <http://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.shtml>. If you wish to use copyrighted material from this site for purposes of your own that go beyond 'fair use', you must obtain permission from the copyright owner.